Mr. B. Deva Gowda.—

Are these centres meant to be worked at a profit ?

First Member of Council.—

No.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Is it not possible to work them for profit ?

First Member of Council.—

Not in the early stages.

MESSRS. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO (Koppa Taluk), K. T. SATYANARAYANA SETTY (Kadur Taluk), G. KARIYANNA (Minority Interest), N. M. SIVALINGAPPAIYA and K. THIMMEGOWDA (Kadur Taluk), and M. S. DYAVEGOWDA (Koppa Taluk).—

Q.—33. Will the Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) The names of newspapers the licenses whereof were cancelled by the Government ?

(*b*) The date or dates on which the orders cancelling licenses were issued.

(*c*) Whether the orders were communicated to the parties affected and the press?

(*d*) What were the reasons that actuated the Government for taking such steps?

(*e*) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House the copies of such orders issued from time to time?

(*f*) Whether they did not hold out a promise in the Legislative Council that the Press Law in Mysore would be repealed and that this had also obtained the consent of our beloved Sovereign?

(*g*) Have the Government taken any action in the direction of the repeal of the Press Regulation? If not, why not?

(*h*) How many newspapers have been permitted to be edited recently and what are they?

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—33. (*a*), (*b*), (*d*) and (*e*) The following Government Orders are laid on the table (Appendix VI):—

(1) 4372-80—C-B. 183-22, dated the 16th February 1923.

(2) 3093--C.B. 177-28-21, dated the 21st May 1926.

(3) 1941-50—P.P. 114-27-17, dated the 17th October 1928.

(4) 2936-44—P.P. 44-28-13, dated the 18th December 1928.

(5) 3104-6—P P. 44-28-14, dated the 3rd January 1929.

(6) 3107-9 —P.P. 44-28-15, dated the 3rd January 1929.

(7) 3110-2—P.P. 44-28-16, dated the 3rd January 1929.

(8) 3862-3—P.P. 44-28-33, dated the 26th February 1929.

(9) 4013-7—P.P. 44-28-36, dated the 15th March 1929.

(10) 4388-91—P.P. 44-28-42, dated the 11th April 1929.

(11) 5244-46—P.P. 44-28-63, dated the 4th June 1929.

(*c*) The orders were placed on the Press Table and the District Magistrates of Districts were asked to communicate them to the persons concerned.

(*f*) The attention of the members is invited to the discussions at the Legislative Council meeting held in March 1928 when a resolution on the subject was moved.

(*g*) A Draft Bill is under the consideration of Government.

(*h*) *Vide* reply to Question No. 1 (*a*).

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Messrs. Satyanarayana Chetty and Hosakoppa Krishna Rao.

Please see Page 18, Appendix I, Annexure A, 1928-29, No. 5.—Mr. H. Srikantiah, Mysore. The date of receipt of this application is 3-9-28 and the date of its disposal is 10-12-1928.

Again as regards Nos. 14 and 15, the date of application is 8-11-1928 and date of disposal is 9-11-1928.

Similarly, in regard to Nos. 19 and 20, the dates of the applications are 29-11-1928 and 2-12-1928 respectively and the date of disposal is 13-12-1928.

It would be seen therefrom that Government disposed of certain cases in one day and in other cases it took 4 months. Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons for the delay in the disposal of such applications?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Reports have to be received from the District Magistrates concerned. In certain cases the information was readily available. Wherever there was delay, it means that it was due to the non-receipt of the reports.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

In certain cases Government offered reasons for refusal of permission and in others they did not do so. Why?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

In cases in which Government considered it necessary, reasons were given and in cases in which they deemed it unnecessary they did not.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

Government have stated that a quasi-judicial enquiry would be held before the cancellation of the license. Will the Government be pleased to state if any such enquiry was held before the license granted to Mr. M. Venkatakrishniah was withdrawn?

Third Member of Council.—

No quasi-judicial enquiry was held in this case.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

What was the cause for that decision?

Third Member of Council.—

It was considered unnecessary. Government have passed the order under the powers vested in them under the Mysore Newspapers Regulation. The law does not require such an enquiry, although Government passed proceedings with a view to minimise hardship that an enquiry would be made. In certain other cases also, Government considered it unnecessary to hold a quasi-judicial enquiry. For instance, the case of the late *Prajamitra* and *Chennabasaveswara*, Government thought it unnecessary to hold any such enquiry.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

In the year 1916 a quasi-judicial enquiry was held in the case of one newspaper. The *Mysore Patriot* was a long-

standing paper. Was it not desirable as such to hold a quasi-judicial enquiry?

Third Member of Council.—

There is no more information that I have to give you. The reasons are known to the Editor.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

Was it not necessary that the public should know them?

Third Member of Council.—

It was considered unnecessary.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

It is stated that there is a Draft Bill under consideration. When will it come? What is the form in which it is? Is it not possible to give that information?

Third Member of Council.—

A draft was prepared some time ago. Government find it necessary to modify it further. It is only a draft which is under consideration. It has never been published.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

What is the form?

Third Member of Council.—

It is only in a preliminary stage and is a substitute for the present Newspaper Regulation.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

Are you going to substitute an amending Bill?

Third Member of Council.—

The whole thing is under consideration. It is not possible to say anything further.

Mr. H. Krishna Rao.—

Is it possible to expect it in the next Assembly?

Third Member of Council.—

We cannot give that assurance.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

Government passed an executive order for holding a quasi-judicial enquiry some time back. Was it not meant to form the policy of the Government for the future?

Third Member of Council.—

You can form your own opinion.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

Is it not the duty of the Government to abide by that order?

Second Member of Council.—

We are not bound to follow it.

Mr. K. T. Seshaiya.—

Will the Government be pleased to state if any period was fixed in the order dated 3rd January 1929 withdrawing the permission granted to Mr. M. Venkatakrishniah to edit the *Mysore Patriot*?

Second Member of Council.—

No period was fixed.

Adjournment Motion.

At this stage, MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI invited the attention of the Dewan to the adjournment motion proposed by certain members to be moved in the House and requested that a time might be fixed for discussing it.

The motion read as follows:—

"That the business of the House be adjourned to discuss the propriety of the orders passed by the City Magistrates of Mysore and Bangalore under Section 45 of the Mysore Police Regulation prohibiting the holding of meetings and assemblies within the local areas of the said cities, without obtaining licenses from the above Magistrates."

THE DEWAN explained that this was a matter which concerned the Judicial Department, that this Assembly could not decide the correctness or the incorrectness of the orders passed by the City Magistrates and that if anybody felt aggrieved there was nothing to prevent him from taking the matter to the Chief Court and having the order tested. He said that this motion was opposed to Rule 5 and that he could not therefore allow it.

MESSRS. PUTTASWAMI, NARASINGA RAO, KRISHNA RAO and others said that the matter was of an urgent and public importance, that the Chief Court had in their previous decisions expressed the view that they had no power to set aside such an order, that if the District Magistrate had passed an order under Section 46 it was illegal, but that the City Magistrate did it under the powers vested in him in Section 45 of the Police Regulation, that as such if this order was not set aside, even a co-operative meeting could not be held in the city and that the Assembly could not be deprived of its right to discuss this motion.

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT invited the attention of the members of the House to the discussion on Page 1 of 13, Mysore Law Reports, on the authority of which the Chief Court had cancelled an order passed by a certain District Magistrate under Section 27 of the Mysore Police Rules (Section 45 of the Police Regulation) after issuing a notice and hearing arguments.

It was contended by MR. PUTTASWAMI and others that in the case referred to above, the District Magistrate acted without jurisdiction and that in the present case the City Magistrates had issued the order under Section-45 of the Police Regulation.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the Assembly might discuss the propriety or the impropriety of the policy behind that order, but not the correctness of that order.

MR. PUTTASWAMI was prepared to amend the motion accordingly.

THE DEWAN pointed out that the motion, as it stood, had to be disallowed.

DISCUSSIONS ON THE BUDGET.

MR. K. T. SESHAIYA stated that although the Dewan's Address expressed great satisfaction on the increased revenues of the State with the prospect of considerable addition thereto as a result of the recommendations of the Butler Committee, he could not share that satisfaction unless the burden of taxation on the people was appreciably reduced. He was of opinion that, if the people should be satisfied, land revenue should be reduced, toll gates abolished and the Court Fee and Stamp Fee should be brought to their former level. At the present rate of the expenditure to the Government, he thought that any amount of increased